

Message

**From:** [REDACTED] **Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)**  
**Sent:** 6/25/2014 5:52:21 PM  
**To:** Jinot, Jennifer [Jinot.Jennifer@epa.gov]  
**CC:** Subramaniam, Ravi [Subramaniam.Ravi@epa.gov]; Bussard, David [Bussard.David@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** Re: Letter to editor in clearance  
**Attachments:** Bottom up letter-jj-CC.docx

Ravi:

Since I'll be out to my farm for the whole afternoon, and running around tomorrow, I thought that it is better for me to provide my comments now to prevent unnecessary delay. I don't see any problems after taking into accounts of all the comments and suggestions by David and Jennifer. I add only 2 comments-- CC1 and CC19.

Chao

----- Original Message -----

**From:** "Jennifer Jinot" <Jinot.Jennifer@epa.gov>  
**To:** "Ravi Subramaniam" <Subramaniam.Ravi@epa.gov>, "David Bussard" <Bussard.David@epa.gov>, [REDACTED] **Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)**  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 24, 2014 2:23:44 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Letter to editor in clearance

here are my comments/suggestions. jj

**From:** Subramaniam, Ravi  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 24, 2014 2:07 PM  
**To:** Bussard, David; Jinot, Jennifer; [REDACTED] **Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)**  
**Subject:** RE: Letter to editor in clearance

Looks like we are on a roll! I suggest we do the edits sequentially. Jennifer is on it now. I'll work on it after Jennifer circulates hers, then Chao, and then we will send it to Kenny

Ravi.

-----  
Ravi Subramaniam, PhD; Associate, Quantitative Methods Branch, IRIS Division, NCEA-ORD, US EPA  
(703) 347-8606 (Tu, W, Th); [REDACTED] **Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)** (M, F)  
-----

**From:** Bussard, David  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 24, 2014 12:27 PM  
**To:** Subramaniam, Ravi; Jinot, Jennifer; [REDACTED] **Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP)**  
**Subject:** FW: Letter to editor in clearance

Ravi, Jennifer and Chao,

I took a shot at considering the comments from Lynn and Kacee. In some places, I might prefer our original wording, but I figure if we can live with the changes we should do so, and take it as a signal that while we may have had a good reason for something (such as putting a phrase in quotes), that may not have been what our words and punctuations conveyed to others.

The one I am less inclined to take is:

- [REDACTED] **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)** [REDACTED]  
-

I took a shot at redrafting the two sentences Lynn and Kacee flagged in second paragraph, on the theory that perhaps more words is less "elegant" but clearer. But, one of you might easily improve on that first take at revision... !

If we settle, then we can check with Kenny.

David

From: Flowers, Lynn  
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2014 10:07 AM  
To: Bussard, David; Jinot, Jennifer; Subramaniam, Ravi  
Cc: Deener, Kathleen; Walsh, Debra  
Subject: Letter to editor in clearance

HI all: I just cleared this through STICS but had a couple of edits. There is also one important place where I don't think the text is really clear. See what you think about that. I put notes in each place to explain my logic!

I am ccing Debra as the package goes to her next.

Lynn

Lynn Flowers, PhD, DABT  
Associate Director for Health  
National Center for Environmental Assessment  
US EPA  
Washington, DC  
703-347-8537